



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| | | • • | | ** | |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
| 09/492,079 | 01/27/2000 | Hiromi Sutou | 501.38112X00 | 9424 | |
| 20457 7 | 12/05/2003 | EXAMINER | | | |
| ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP | | | TODD, GREGORY G | | |
| SUITE 1800 | 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889 | | | 2157 | 10 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003 | 5 | |
| | | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Peg Peg | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| " Advisory Action | 09/492,079 | SUTOU, HIROMI | | | | |
| • | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Gregory G Todd | 2157 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence address | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a sinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR R | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | /see NOTE helow): | | | | |
| (a) ⋈ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the | | | | | | |
| issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cance | eling a corresponding number of | finally rejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woul canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | d be allowable if submitted in a s | separate, timely filed amendment | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request f application in condition for allowance because: _ | | sidered but does NOT place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ecause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows | s: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . | Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap | B.□ The drawing correction filed on is a)□ approved or b)□ disapproved by the Examiner. ✓ | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem 10. Other: | ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | fell 14 | | | | |
| | ار | SALEH NAJJAR PRIMARY EXAMINER | | | | |

خ بالأند

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/492,079

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amended claims present new issues that would require further search and consideration. The attribute information / content to indicate the particular relationship, herein a hierarchical relationship, would require further search and consideration. The applicant's arguments presented are directed toward limitations presented in the amendment which will not be entered.

The applicant further argues the transferral process of Arakawa is not controlled by said attribute information. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., attribute information controlling item transmission) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).